## REMARKS

Claims 17-19, 21, 23, 24, 31, 33, 35-39, 41, 43, 44, 51, 53, 55-65, 67, 69-73, 75, 77 and 78 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 17, 19, 31, 37, 39, 51, 59, 61, 63, 65, 71 and 78 are amended. Claims 19 and 39 are amended to address a claim objection; claims 65 and 73 were amended to maintain consistency with amended independent claims 63 and 71, respectively; and claim 78 is amend to correct a typographical error and maintain consistency with claim 71 from which claim 78 depends.

No new matter is added to the application by this Amendment. The features added to independent claims 17, 31, 37, 51, 59, 61, 63 and 71 find support in canceled claims 1, 9 and 14, as originally filed, and within the specification, as orginally filed, at, for example, paragraphs [0011], [0012], [0022] and [0029]-[0031] of U.S. Patent Publication No.: 2004/0122913 for the present application.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

## I.      Claim Objections

Claimd 19 and 39 objected to for alleged informalities. Specifically, the Patent Office objects to claims 19 and 39 as allegedly reciting the step "(d)(ii)" which no longer existing within independent claims 17 and 37, from which dependent claims 19 and 39 depend, respectively.

Amended claims 19 and 39 overcome the objections made by the Patent Office.

In view of the amendments to claims 19 and 39, Applicant submit that the claim objections are moot.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the claims is respectfully requested.

## II.     Rejection Under 35 USC 102

Claims 17-19, 21, 23, 31, 33, 35, 37-39, 41, 43, 51, 53, 55, 57, 58, 63-65, 67, 69, 71-73,

75 and 77 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No.

7,028,102 to Larsson et al. (hereinafter "Larsson"). Applicants respectfully traverse this

rejection.

With respect to independent claims 17, 31, 37, 51, 63 and 71, the Patent Office alleges

that Larsson discloses each and every feature of the claims. In response to Applicant's April 22,

2009 Amendment, the Patent Office acknowledges that Applicant's Arguments (A)-(D) have

been fully considered but alleges that Applicant's Arguments (A)-(D) are not persuasive.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the allegations by the Patent Office.

Regarding Applicant's Argument (A), the Patent Office alleges that it is noted that the

features upon which Applicant relies (i.e., transmitting a print file to a storage location in the

network) are not recited in the rejected claims. Applicant disagrees with this allegation by the

Patent Office.

Amended claims 17, 37, 63 and 71 require a step of (claims 17, 63 and 71) or means for

(claim 37) storing the hypertext page at a location in the communication network and a step of

(claims 17, 63 and 71) or means for (claim 37) providing the hypertext page containing the print

file resulting from the print job for recall from a location in the communication network.

Amended claims 31 and 51 require a step of (claim 31) or means for (claim 51) storing the

converted data or files in a location in the communication network and a step of (claim 31) or

means for (claim 51) providing the converted data or file for recall from a location in the

communication network.

Nowhere does Larsson teach or suggest a step of (claims 17, 63 and 71) or means for

(claim 37) storing the hypertext page at a location in the communication network and a step of

(claims 17, 63 and 71) or means for (claim 37) providing the hypertext page containing the print

file resulting from the print job for recall from a location in the communication network as

required in amended claims 17, 37, 63 and 71. Moreover, Larsson fails to teach or suggest a step

of (claim 31) or means for (claim 51) storing the converted data or files in a location in the

communication network and a step of (claim 31) or means for (claim 51) providing the converted

data or file for recall from a location in the communication network as required by claims 31 and

51.

With respect to Applicant's Argument (B), the Patent Office alleges that Larsson clearly

discloses a hypertext page containing a print file resulting from a print job for recall on a location

in a communication network and cites to the passages at col. 10, line 49 – col. 11, line 39 and

col. 11, lines 35-39 as support for this allegations. However, this passage teaches the following:

> Now assume that a travelling service technician is trav-
> 50 elling around the world servicing and repairing industrial
> robots. During an assignment he encounters a malfunction in
> a robot he is not very familiar with. He then needs the
> documentation of the robot. To get the documentation he
> asks for a printer having a Printer Server according to a
> 55 preferred embodiment of the invention. He could also use
> his cellular telephone and instruct it to check the nearby
> surroundings for a communication device that is providing
> the service according to the invention.
> Now referring to FIGS. 1 and 8, when the service tech-
> 60 nician locates a communication device 300, he uses his
> WAP-enabled cellular telephone 100 to connect, step 510, to
> an operator that provides a WAP-gateway 12 to the Internet
> 10. Then a WAP-page is presented, step 512, on the display
> of the telephone 100 from which he can browse a web of
> 65 linked WAP-pages by selecting links, 514, presented on the
> display. Every time a link is selected, the telephone 100
> checks if the link is pointing at another WAP-page or not,

step **516**. If the link points at another WAP-page, that page is downloaded and presented on the display, step **512**, and the procedure is repeated, steps **512–516**. A known WAP-page is also possible to get to by having the address of it stored in the telephone **100** and then selecting it or simply by typing the address in the information browser of the telephone **100**.

In one of the above-mentioned ways, the service technician gets an information page containing a link to the document he needs presented, step **512**. Now, he selects the link to the document, step **514**, which is not a WAP-page. The telephone **100** checks if the link is pointing at a WAP-page, step **516**, and finds out that it is not. Then the telephone **100** presents a print/download dialog, step **518**. If the service technician selects download, the document could be downloaded, step **522**, to a computer nearby, for example via the short-range communication link. However, if he selects print, the telephone **100** will broadcast an identity request via the short-range communication interface to all communication devices **300** within reach of the telephone **100** in regard of short-range communication **20**, step **524**. If there is no response to the request, an error message is presented in the display, step **528**, indicating that there is no compatible communication device **300** available. Then the telephone **100** returns to step **512** and presents the WAP-page again. If there is one or more communication devices **300** responding to the request, the communication devices **300** are presented on the display, step **530**. Then the service technician is enabled to select one of the communication devices **300** displayed, step **530**. When one communication device **300** is selected, the telephone **100** sends a request to the selected communication device **300** for a printer specification, step **534**. The communication device **300** returns a printer specification which is received at the telephone **100**, step **536**. Then a print request comprising a document address, given by the selected link, and the printer specification is sent to a print service device **210** of an information service provider **200**, step **538**, via the wireless telephone network **14**.

The passage cited by the Patent Office is concerned with the process of sending the print request whereby no print file resulting from a print job even exists. Applicant submits that Larsson uses the term "print file" in a similar sense as the present claims in the present

application. Embedding the selected link in the print request as cited in Larsson (see col. 11, lines 33-39) may correspond to, at best, presently claimed feature (a) of claims 17, 31, 37, 51, 63 and 71. Larsson's embedded print files do not disclose a hypertext page containing the print file resulting from the print job for recall on a location in a communication network as alleged by the Patent Office. Moreover, the passage cited by the Patent Office has nothing to do with features (d) or (e) of claims 17, 31, 37, 51, 63 and 71, wherein embedding of a print file resulting from a print job is defined. Thus, Larrson fails to teach or suggest the features specifically defined in features (d) and (e) of amended claims 17, 31, 37, 51, 63, and 71.

Because the features of independent claims 17, 31, 37, 51, 63 and 71 are neither taught nor suggested by Larsson, Larsson cannot anticipate, and would not have rendered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, the features specifically defined in amended independent claims 17, 31, 37, 51, 63 and 71 and their dependent claims.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 USC 102(e) are respectfully requested.


## III.    Rejections Under 35 USC 103

### A.    Larsson in view of Christfort et al.

Claims 24, 36, 44, 56, 70 and 78 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Larsson in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,089,295 to Christfort et al. (hereinafter "Christfort")  The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Patent Office acknowledges that Larsson does not teach or suggest a step wherein transmitting takes place via SMS. The Patent Office introduces Christfort as allegedly remedying the deficiencies of Larsson. Applicant respectfully disagrees with these allegations.

Christfort fails to remedy the deficiencies of Larsson as described above with respect to claims 17, 31, 37, 51, 63 and 71, from which claims 24, 36, 44, 56, 70 and 78, respectively.

Thus, Larsson and Christfort, taken singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a step of (claims 17, 63 and 71) or means for (claim 37) storing the hypertext page at a location in the communication network and a step of (claims 17, 63 and 71) or means for (claim 37) providing the hypertext page containing the print file resulting from the print job for recall from a location in the communication network as required in amended claims 17, 37, 63 and 71.

Additionally, Larsson and Christfort, taken singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a step of (claim 31) or means for (claim 51) storing the converted data or files in a location in the communication network and a step of (claim 31) or means for (claim 51) providing the converted data or file for recall from a location in the communication network as required by claims 31 and 51

Because the features of independent claims 17, 31, 37, 51, 63 and 71 are not taught or suggested by Larsson and Christfort, taken singly or in combination, these references would not have rendered the features of claims 17, 31, 37, 51, 63 and 71 and their dependent claims obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, claims 24, 36, 44, 56, 70 and 78 are patentable over all the applied references. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

### B.     Larsson in view of Christfort

Claims 59-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Larsson in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0138564 to Treptow et al. (hereinafter "Treptow")  The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to independent claims 59 and 61, the Patent Office acknowledges that Larsson does not teach or suggest that the data source is an e-mail attachment.  The Patent Office introduces Treptow as allegedly disclosing e-mail attachments as data sources in a communication network that provides output data from data sources.  The Patent Office alleges that it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate Treptow's teaching into Larsson's method for the purpose of supporting one of the most popular data sources by implementing e-mail attachments as data sources for outputting data or printing files, thereby providing a more user friendly and more efficient system.  Applicant respectfully disagrees with these allegations

As similarly discussed above with respect to the rejection under 35 USC 102(e), Larsson fails to teach or suggest (1) storing the the print file resulting from the print job or the converted output data or the converted output file at a location in the communication network and (2) providing the print file resulting from the print job or the converted output data or the converted output file for recall from the location in the communication network as required by amended claim 59.

Moreover, Larsson fails to teach or suggest (3) means for storing the print file resulting from the print job, the converted output data or the converted output file at a location in the communication network and (4) means for providing the print file resulting from the print job or

the converted output data or the converted output file for recall from a location in the communication network as required by amended claim 61.

Treptow fails to remedy the deficiencies of Larsson because Treptow also fails to disclose the specifically defined features recited in claims 59 and 61.

Thus, Larsson and Treptow, taken singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest (1) storing the the print file resulting from the print job or the converted output data or the converted output file at a location in the communication network and (2) providing the print file resulting from the print job or the converted output data or the converted output file for recall from the location in the communication network as required by amended claim 59.

Furthermore, Larsson and Treptow, taken singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest (3) means for storing the print file resulting from the print job, the converted output data or the converted output file at a location in the communication network and (4) means for providing the print file resulting from the print job or the converted output data or the converted output file for recall from a location in the communication network as required by amended claim 61.

Because the features of independent claims 59 and 61 are not taught or suggested by Larsson and Treptow, taken singly or in combination, these references would not have rendered the features of claims 59 and 61 and their dependent claims obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, claims 59-62 are patentable over all the applied references. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

## IV.    Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.  Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 17-19, 21, 23, 24, 31, 33, 35-39, 41, 43, 44, 51, 53, 55-65, 67, 69-73, 75, 77 and 78 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

## CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If entry and consideration of the amendments above requires an extension of time, Applicant respectfully requests that this be considered a petition therefor.  The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee(s) due in this connection to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

## ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fees, or credit any excess, to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,

NORRIS MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By    /Brian C. Anscomb/
        Brian C. Anscomb
        Reg. No. 48,641
        875 Third Avenue, 8th Floor
        New York, New York 10022
        Phone:  (212) 808-0700
        Fax:     (212) 808-0844